G P S IX-5]

Previous references

1909.
(Mis 2)

File No. 767

Serial Nos.
1–2

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for June 18

SUBJECT.

Mathkala Devaru matt at
Kanaur Magadi Taluk

D. C. Bangalore No. 3619/25.6.

Recognizes Renanna alias
Niranjan swami as guru of —

W D 1250—GPB—30,000 26 1 19

G. R. S. III—1] 1909

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Jmu2)

NOTES.

File No. 767

FILE HEADING.

Makkala Devaru Matt
near Kancnoor Malavi Taluk,

From

No.	Dated	Received
Diary No.	Enclos. Spare Copies.	Serial No.

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

NOTES—First Sheet.

G. R. S. III-2j

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 767 of 1909

Serial No.

From the Dy Coll. Bangalore No 35-8
12-1-10 Submits the report called for above together with vernacular correspondence in the matter.

The facts of the case are as follows:—

The Makkala Devaru matt at the Kanamur village Nagadey Taluk is a Murrai Institution belonging to the Lingayet sect, having been endowed with the following Inam lands aggregating 45 acres 36 guntas and assessed at Rs 56/- -

S No	nature	extent acre gun	assessment Rs as ps
9	Dry	18. 30	16 - -
11	Dry	1 - 7	1 - 12 - 0
	garden	0 - 25	2 - 8 - 0
	wet - -	4 - 9	14 - 12 - 0
36 (Part)	Dry -	21 - 5	21 - - -
	Total -	45 - 36	56 - - -

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—1d 5 08

P.T.O

NOTE—Contn sheet

Serial No.

2. The Guru of this matt viz Santa Veera-swamy died in march or April 1907, and the bone of contention between the Banajigars and Pandrachara Gouda is the nomination of his successor.

3. Petitions were received from the Banajigars of the Honnudike village of the Nagar Taluk, stating that the question of the nomination of a successor to this matt has been settled by the Muruji matt at Chitaldrug and pending such nomination, the matt properties may be taken over under Govt. management. (vide Petn of Seyman Honnaseth & others dt 20.10.07 addressed to His Highness the Maharaja).

4 A petition was also received to the same effect from the Agent of the Muruji matt also.

5 These petitions were sent to the Local Authorities who at once took action thereon and ordered that the matt properties should be taken possession of by the Patel of Shanthoj of Kanamur & Thondi Begur villages, both of which contain disciples of this matt.

6. The agent of the Muruji matt again wrote on 1.6.08 that the

NOTE—Contn sheet

GPB- 50,000--23-10-05

Serial No.

Swamy of that matt has appointed one Krijamurti (Sivamurti) Devaru as the Guru of the matt in question, and that the matt properties might be handed over to his possession.

7. Local enquiry was held and the Amildar has recorded the depositions of the parties concerned. The Panchachar Sowdas who are chiefly resident in the village of Hanamur contend that the Swami of the Mirigi matt has delegated the power of naming the Aggra of this and 72 other matts, to the Dodbele matt, which has in its turn entrusted this authority to the Jotada Swami of the Kanchugal Bande matt. In virtue of this power, the latter Jtada Swami of the Bande matt ~~appointed~~ has been reported to have appointed on[x] 17-5-07 one Revanna as Aggra in an assembly of about 200 persons under the title of 'Nirinjana Swami'. This appointment is also stated to be in reference to the last wishes of the late (Swamy) Santaveera Swamy.

[x] (whom the lingayets of all classes acknowledge as their chief Spiritual Head),

x H.K.

8. In support of this

NOTE—Contn sheet

Serial No.

The Panchacharas have produced the original of a letter stated to have been written by Rudrappa of Dodbele matt to Thotada Swami of the Bande matt stating that the former who has been entrusted with control over 63 Muths by Siddage was unable to discharge this trust, and requesting the latter to exercise the same control over them. They also produce an original intimation of this by the said Rudrappa to one Gurukar Prasannaiya of Banavadi. A few title deeds in their possession have also been produced to show that they have all along been the repositories of the papers belonging the matt.

9. The contention of the Murigi matt is that the Swami of that matt has not delegated any such power of exercising control over any of the Lingayat matts to anybody & that he has the control over them himself. This matt has produced some judgments by the Coorg subordinate in which the statements of very respectable gentlemen like Mr. K. P

Note—Contn. sheet

Serial No.

Puttamma chetty, Subbi Bādappa, Vidwan Danappa Sastry ("a very learned man," in Mr. Puttamma chetty's words) &c are recorded, and the matts right to Exercise control over other Lingayet matts in India is fully discussed. The contention of the Murugi matt is also that the Bande matt and Makkala Devaru matt belong to different Budakats, the former to the Sanna Barahada Budakat, and the latter to Makkala Devaru Budakat, and that the matt of one Budakat cannot appoint an agya to that of another Budakat. Documentary Evidence is produced in support of this contention

X 7t U

10. The Judgment given in original Rev Case No 3 of 1870-71 on the file of the Asst Comr of Bangalore goes fully into the Budakat question, and has decided that the Makkala Devaru matt belongs to the Makkala Devaru Budakat. There is also a deposition of the Predecessor of the Present Mada Swamie that he belongs to a matt of a different Budakat than the Makkala Devaru matt.

MGCPB—20,000—1-11-01

Serial No.

11. In the Jaine Rev: Code, the late swami of the Mattkala devaru matt ~~has~~ (viz Santavira swami) has deposed that the arya of this matt should be an aradhya & no body else, & also that owing to the Patel Ranjappa having appeared to prove loyal to the matt, certain matt papers had been entrusted to him (the Patel) but he ~~also~~ has since been the cause of quarrels and discord, and has been trying to set up one of his own sect as guru of this matt.

12 The matt being a murzai institution, the points for consideration are :—

(i) Whether the swamy of this matt should ~~always~~ be selected from any one particular sect.

(ii) If so, from what sect.

(iii) Whether he may be ~~also elected~~ nominated by the disciples of any sect.

(iv) Whether the Chitaldrug Murzai matt has authority over this matt, & exercises control

J

NOTE—Contn sheet

Nomination of successor &c.

(V) Whether the Muriji matt has delegated such power to any body.

(VI) Whether Kanchiyar Bande matt has at any time conferred Sanyasa & appointed any guru of the matt-kala Devaru matt.

13. From the Records available these issues can be answered thus: -

(i) & (ii) The Previous Swamy (Santalinga Swamy says that the Swamy of this matt should be an Aradhya.

(iii) No such instances have been cited by the Bande matt (which is no doubt interested in this issue)

(iv) The judgment of the Coorg Sub Judge decides the power of the Muriji matt over all Lingayat Virakta matts in India. The respectable gentlemen above resp^d to whose Statements have been recorded by that judge say "He (Guru of the "Muriji matt) is the head & Controlling "authority for all the Virakta matts in "India. He has certainly got the power to "appoint or remove the Guru of any Virakta "matt under his jurisdiction"

MGCPB—20 000—1-11-01

Serial No.

(V) There are no records of such delegation by the Muriga matt Swami to any body. The letter from Dodbele matto to Bande matt is no proof of the delegation of the power by the Muriga matt to the Dodbele matt.

(VI) There are no records to this effect.

14. Kind attention is also invited to the list of matto produced by the Kanchigal matt Swami & stated to have been entrusted to his control. On counting the No. of matto, the total No. comes to 49 matto & not 63. Further, if as alleged by the Bande matt, the Makkala Devaru matt was ~~entrusted to the~~ put under the jurisdiction of the Swami of the former matt, it should have been one of the 5 matto in the Magadi Taluk in the list. It is conspicuous by its absence. This shows that this matt at all events is not under the control of the Bande matt Swami.

15. The Deputy Com^r while submitting the Vernacular papers drew attention to the case says

X Papers marked A to F

MGCPB—20,000—1-11-01

Serial No.

that in view of the matt being an insignificant one, Govt. interference seems uncalled for, and that the Managers of the Institution may be permitted to settle the affairs in the manner best calculated to promote the interests of the matt, Especially since factions exist.

16. In this connection it is submitted that ~~whether the matt~~ insignificant as the matt is, the question involved is the appointment of a successor to the Guruship of the matt, & is therefore one that has to be submitted for the sanction of His Highness the Maha-raja; and the existence of factions must form the most potent reason for Govt. interference Especially in view of the fact that the factions have such irreconcilable differences

Submitted for orders.

RL
1/7/10

Proposal is not for Govt. sanction
I shall inspect
Comp. Shivpuri 4/7/1910

G R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 157 of 190

Serial No.

From, Yejamaan Honna Setty of Honnadike,

Petition Dy 3 9 1910

Complains that it is opposed to manual to appoint a Guru from Panchada Gowda family to Makkaleduruvu matt, that Patel Ranjappa who was on inimical terms with the late Guru, is trying to obtain unlawfull possession of the matt by appointing his own Guru from the said family and prays that the nomination of one Sivamoorty as Guru by the Muragi matt, may be recognized by Govt

Submitted. The file is reserved for

21.9.10 under-Secretary's personal

Note inspection of the matt.

17/2/1911 Perused.

Looking to Correspondence with the Ullavar Matt (file No. 386 of 1911-12) this Secretariat Comm. the legality of the Said that in the doubts about the order 7/1892 as regards succession to Matts. The disposal of this case may be awaited

17/2/1911

From, Honna Setty of Honnadike

Petition Dy 11-2-1913

Prays that Sivamurthy Swamy appointed as Guru by the Muragi matt may be Confirmed, and the matt and its properties

Note—Contn sheet

GPB—10,000—27 4 09

Serial No.

may be handed over to Swaminathy Swamy in order to enable him to attend to the religious and spiritual wants of the Matt disciples, and adds that the documents relied on by his opponents are spurious

The Petition seems to have been presented to the 1st Cr, and the Cr's order thereon is :— "Murgesan, For Early note etc" Submitted for orders

AV (1329) 12/2/13

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 157 of 1917.

Serial No.

Muzrai Secretary's Note.

The facts of the case are given in sufficient detail in the preceding notes and I have also placed on record a copy of an incomplete note in pencil drawn up by my predecessor Mr. A. Subramanya Iyer, which summarises the contentions of the two parties.

Before, however, proceeding to note my views on the case, I beg to place on record my great regret at the delay that has been allowed to occur in its submission for orders. Mr. Subramanya Iyer was of opinion that a local inspection and an informal enquiry would facilitate a fair disposal of the important and contentious ~~xx~~ issues raised in th case, an opinion in which I concurred particularly as the record of enquiry on which orders were sought were far from complete. The matter was brought on the list of cases for personal inspection, but I was not able to find time to undertake the work owing to pressure of other work both Secretariat and special, while the village itself was not easily accessible being situated about ten miles from the nearest formed road. I have now availed myself of the earliest opportunity to visit the village with the Sub Division Officer of Closepet and the Amildar of Magady and had an informal talk and discussion with the villagers and other interested persons of

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 1233—GPE—60 000—1 12-16—S

Serial No.

both factions who had assembled in large numbers.

Briefly the salient facts are as follow. Santa Viraswami of Makkaladevaru Matt in Kannur died on the 14th May 1907 without having nominated a successor. Three days after, i.e. on 17th May 1907, a Sabha was held presided over by the Ayya of Kenchigal Bande Matt wherein one Revanna a disciple of this Matt was chosen as successor and given Asrama. Proceedings of the meeting were drawn up and it has been signed by as many as 116 persons representing 25 villages including the Virakta Swamis of the Matts at Hulikal, Chikamaskal, Solur & Thippasndra and Kempanna the brother of the late Swami who is even now in possession of the Matt properties. It is true that the Swami of the Kenchgal Matt announced at the meeting that Revanna had been also nominated by the late Santa Viraswami and that the Bande Matt had the right of nomination delegated to it. Whatever might have been the effect of these assertions upon the meeting and however defective might be the proof advanced in support of them yet the facts that the nomination was approved by the meeting and that the nominee was thereupon inducted into Asrama may be taken as well established, in spite of aspersions to the contrary made by the opponents.

An agitation appears to have been set up sometime later by the Banagigars to capture or retain

WD 1233—GPB—60 000—1 12-16—S

Serial No

the Matt for their particular faction, the nominee Revanna being admittedly a Panchachar and the Murgi Matt appears to have been induced to nominate a successor. One Karibasavaiya calling himself the Agent of the Matt petitioned Government that Makkal Devaru Matt was subject to the control of the Murgi Matt ~~who~~ which had the right of nomination and that the properties of the former Matt might be preserved by Government pending the appointment of a Swami by the latter. The petition is dated more than 5½ months after the demise of the Swami and the induction of Revanna. This petition was followed four months later by another communication from the Agen stating that one Sivamurti Devaru has been appointe as Swami and that the Matt properties may be handed over to him. Petitions have also since been received from some of the alleged disciples of Makkala Devara Matt, chief among whom is Yejaman ~~Xxxxxxx~~ Honna Shetty of Honnudi in the Tumkur Taluk

The most important of the objections raised against Revanna's succession, centres round the fact that he is a member of the Sanna Baraha Budakatt while the Makkala Devara Matt belongs to Makkala Devara Budakatt. It is alleged that a person of one Budakatt cannot succeed to a Matt of another Budakatt and that Revanna is consequently incompetent to succeed to the Matt. It is understood that

WD 1238—GPB—60,000—1 12-16—S

Serial No.

there are as many as 64 Budakatts among the Sivachar and it would be interesting to know if there are separate Matts and followers to every one of these. No information is available as to what Budakatt the Murgi Matt nominee belongs. It is alleged on the other side that Budakatt is binding in respect to intermarriages but in the case of Virakta, these ordinary restrictions do not count. There is much force in this contention and at any rate it bears strict analogy as regards succession of Brahman Sanyasis to the Matts of various persuasions. My knowledge of Jangama practices is, however, limited and I am unable to advance a decided opinion as to how far the analogy may be safely pushed. If it is considered essential that this point should be further elucidated, I shall refer the matter to some of the leading Sivachar Matadhipatis and learned men even including the Murgi Matt. Whatever may be the practice ordinarily followed, it remains to be considered whether the incapacity is so radical that the Hindu Law principle of Factum Valet should not be made applicable.

There is one other large issue raised in the case which deserves close examination as a definite pronouncement either way will have a far ~~reading~~ reaching effect. The Murgi Matt bases its claim for the recognition of its nominee on the ground

WD 1233—GPB—60 000—3 12-16—S

Serial No

that it has a controlling voice in the nomination o: successors to all Virakta Matts and in support of th claim, the Agent has submitted a copy of a judgment of the Coorg Sub Judge's Court relating to a disputed claim to the properties of a Virakta Matt in Mahadevapur. On the merits of the case, there is no doubt the case was rightly decided. The original grantee of the Inam is described in the Sannad as a Charamurthi of Kodli Mahantaswamy, himself a Charamurthi of Sriman Maha Murgeya Swamy. I a Charamurthy is taken to imply an Agent or Manager there is no doubt Murgi Swamy as the principal has the right to remove and appoint such Charamurtis, which was all that was necessary to decide the case.

An issue was, however, raised in the case regarding the authority vested in the Murgi Matt to exercise disciplinary control over all Jangam Matts wherever situate and it is in connection with this issue that Mr. K. P. Puttanna Chetty is stated to have said that the Murgi Swami 'exercises a general control over all the Lingayet Matts in India and is the highest authority in spiritual matters,' that 'he is the head and controlling authority for all the Virakta Matts in India' and that 'he has certainly got the power to appoint or remove the Guru of any Virakta Matt under his jurisdiction. With due deference to the high position and learning

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 1233—GPB—60 000—1 12-16—S.

Serial No.

of the gentleman, the proposition appears to be, to say the least, too broadly stated. To begin with, there are I believe innumerable Matts which do not ~~xxx~~ owe any allegiance to the Murgi Swami. Within ~~re~~cent times schisms have taken place within the Matt itself, e.g. Sirigiri Matt and the disciplinary power of the Murgi Matt has not been evident. Even in the present case the Swamies of Bandekal and other Matts have acted and are acting in defiance of the ruling of the Murgi Swami. Without presuming to offer any opinion on the sweeping claim put forward perhaps as an ideal to be aimed ~~at~~, it is noteworthy that no evidence has been produced ~~where~~ the Murgi Matt's claim has been accepted by any authority within the State, particularly so far as temporal matters are concerned. Further in the case of the present grant, the endowment is made directly to the Makkala Devara Matt without any recital of its ~~xxxxx~~ relationship to the Murgi Matt. In these circumstances it would appear inexpedient to give an authoritative recognition to the overlordship of the Murgi Matt with respect to all Virakta Matts in the State or in particular to accept the claim that the Murgi Matt has the right of advowson to appoint a Swami to the Makkala Devara Matt.

The next point for consideration is whether Revanna has been rightly chosen. As regards

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

qualifications excepting with respect to his being a member of a different Budakatt, there is nothing said against him personally. He is stated to have been reading Sanskrit and learning the tenets of his sect. The meeting at which he was chosen appears to have been quite an open one with a large representation of Sivachars in the neighbourhood including a number of Jangamas and the own brother of the late Swami. In presence of the assembled villagers of both factions, I noted the number of houses of Pancha-chars and Banajigars in the neighbouring villagers. In Kannur itself there are 40 houses of Panchachars and 8 houses of Banajigars of whom 6 support the cause of Revanna. At Kenkere, Naganhalli, Chowdibegur, Chickmaskal, Mallappenhalli, Gundikere, Marasandra Honnapur, and Bommanahalli there is an overwhelming majority of Panchachars while at Hulikal and Honnudike in the Tumkur Taluk and Sivaganga the majority are Banajigars. At Hulikal there is a Banajigar Jangam Matt while Honnudike and Sivaganga are quite six and five miles from Kannur. Looking at the question from the standpoint of convenience of the majority of the people in the neighbourhood which might well have been a reason for the endowment, the decision has to be in favour of the Panchachars.

In arriving at a solution, it may be noted that the actual attachment of the properties was ma

WD 1283—GPB—60,000—1-12-16—S

Serial No.

G.

by the Amildar without any authority to that effect The petitions of the Banajigars and the Agent of the Murgi Matt was forwarded to the Deputy Commissioners for a report. This was sent on to the Amildar (Mr. ~~C. V.~~ Narayana Rao) who proceeded to attach the Matt and properties and oust Revanna who was apparently in possession. If it is now found that Revanna was rightly chosen and installed, it is only necessary to remove the attachment and direct the Deputy Commissioner to restore the status quo ante, leaving the Murgi Matt to establish by proper evidence the disqualification of Revanna to succeed to the Matt. In that case under Section 25 of the Muzrai Regulavion a meeting od disciples will have to be convened to elect a Swami and in that connection a preliminary enquiry may have to be held as to who are disciples and who are not.

In this connection I may note here that I pointed out the difficulties to the assembled villagers and suggested a compromise but both the factions are ~~evidently~~ still vehemently ~~offered~~ opposed and are not likely to come to any workable solution. Beyond their original communications, the Murgi Matt has not moved in the matter while the Banajigar has been actively pressing the claim on behalf of the Murgi Matt.

Before finally deciding the case a hearing

WD 1213—GPB—60 000—1 12-16—S

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 157 of 1917.

Serial No

may perhaps be given to both the parties, viz., Revanna and Agent of the Murgi Matt. It seems to unnecessary to bring the disciples into the case as beyond their own statement there is nothing to show who are disciples and who are not. I understand that the inam lands in the possession of the Matt will yield about Rs.400 to Rs.500 a year and the Matt has besides some amount of income by way of kanikes from disciples.

20.7.17

313/23.7

Put up with memo for orders

20.7.17

Rec 23/7/17

23/7

27/7

Mr. Krishnamachi for Agent, Murgi Matt; Mr. Ramaiya for Revanna - the latter asks for time to take instructions etc. - Case adjourned. Date will be intimated later

30

2/8

Messrs. Krishnamachi & Ramaiya present. Case called & on being called a second time, there is no appearance of the Appellants

2/8/17

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 1233—GPB—60 000—1.12-16

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 157 of 1917

Serial No.

Respondent present. appt absent
Messrs M Krishnamurti and Basavayya for the
appt. and respt respectively. M.M. Ramachandra
Rao for Honna Setti. — Case was partly
argued. Adjourned.

BO
18/1/18

To 9.4.18 at 8 A.M.

Advocate — for Appt
M. Ramachandra Rao + M. Krishnamurti pray
for an order as per affidavit filed
& pay (Compromise. The affdt. for Respt
M. Basavayya has no objn. to an order.
Can order. —

WG
16/4

From, Mr M. Krishnamurti, Advocate
for the apllt, Razinama dt 14.4.18
Pray that the respt Ramanna
alias Niranjana Swami be recognized
as the "murti" of Makkala Devara
matt, and the properties attached to
the insti be restored to his possession
. The Razinama was presented
to the 1st member of Council by the
Advocate Mr M Krishnamurti the
members order thereon: — "Parties abs

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 1233—GPB—60 000—1 12-16—S

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 157 of 1917.

Serial No

present and admit the Razinama which is accepted the Razinama and the documents accompanying it will be filed with the records.

The documents accompanying the Razinama are indicated below:-

(1) Letter of apology to the Swami of Muruga matt signed by both Totada Devaru of Bande matt, and Renuna Devaru alias Niranjana Devaru

(2 3 & 4) Orders to the ~~matt~~ Manager of Muruga matt, Totada Devaru of Bande matt and Niranjana Devaru the Swami of the Muruga matt desires in these orders that first may be moved to accept Niranjana Devaru as "Murti" of Mallikarjuna Devaru matt and to restore the matt properties to the possession of the latter

Submitted, Muz 7 no 117-17 relating M.M.C. to the lease of the Canada of the matt, is submitted. G.O. no 1807 dy 1-2-1918 on the subject, is flagged

Submitted for orders

25/4/18.

Secy)

9/1

Vide orders on petition 1529 from Murti (Founder) 29.B/1

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 1233—GPB—60 000—1 12-16—S

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 767 - 09 / 157 of 1907

Serial No.

Dept. an order in terms of the Compromise and reporting the R comes to it dra the attachment and handing the properties to the Swami Nirmajna Devaru

Kd. 29/4/18

Submd. with a Dft. order for appl

M 6/5/18

6/5/18

Kd. 7/5/18

420 2/5

(Vt. in order)

Lea 19.5.18

appd

23/5

KB 25/5/18

2. No 3619 Dy 5-1. To D.C Bangalore Recognises Revanna alias Nirmjana Devaru as the guru of the matt and orders the restoration of the properties attached.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

M.F. 767-09-1

19

From Maz F 07
The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To
The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Legal & Rev. Departments
Mysore Branch

Dated 12th January 1910.

Despatched 13

Received

General No.

C & S No. 35

Enclosure No. 2 [illegible]
Secretary

Mysr. Secy's ltr. No. 953, dated 29th August 1908.

States that Kanakur Makki Lakshmanna Mutt is an unincumbered one, but calls for reports as to the finances & accounts and also for the names of the managers of the institution may be permitted to settle the affairs of the institution on the management calculated to promote the interests of the Mutt

Note.

17.1.10

35 25

en 2 files sent separately

Bangalore District
Deputy Commissioner's office
Dated 12th January 1910.

From.

B. J. Kumarasami Naik Esqre. B.A
Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District.

To.

K. T. Balasundaram Iyer Esqre. B.A
offg: Secretary to the Government of Mysore
General and Revenue Departments.
(Mazrai Branch)

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your docket No 953, dated 9th August 1908 in re the Guruship of Kanamur Shakkaladevaru Mutt in the Nagadi Taluk, I have the honor to submit herewith a file of papers ending with the Koshpet Sub Division officer's Yadi No 040, of the 11th/14 January 1909, and to state that the Amildar's report contained in the records gives the facts of the case in detail.

2. I beg to state that Kanamur Shakkaladevaru Mutt is a Mazrai Lingayat institution which has been endowed with the inam-ly related Inam lands, measuring and 36 guntas in extent, and

Mysore Government Assessment
Rs. As. P.
18-30- 16-0-0
1-7- 1-12-0
4-2- 14-12-0
0-25- 2-8-0
Total 24-6-0

36 Mark - Dry — 4 S. 36 — 576 — 0 — 0
Dry —
Dry — —
Wet —
Garden —
9 - /
11 —

assessed at Rs 56/- and that in re
of the death being an insignificant-
me, Government interference in
my opinion seems uncalled for.
The Managers of this institution may
be permitted to settle the affairs of
the institution in the manner best
calculated to promote the interests
of the deceased. This course is all the
more desirable where factions exist-
as in the present case.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

PB

~~1 Sanctions etc~~

(G) Renuna alias Niranjana Swami
the Guru of Makkala [illegible] near
Before the Government of His Highness the Kanakapur, Magadi
Maharaja of Mysore. Taluk)

6 Sub Orders the restoration of Shrine properties attached vide 767-09-2

Case
~~Appeal~~ No. 2 of 1917-18

Pet^rs
~~Appellant~~.

Vs.

Counter Petitioner
~~Respondent~~.

1) Agent of Munagi Renuna alias
Matt Niranjana Swami.

2) Yajaman Honna Setty
of Honnudike, Nelamangala Taluk.
Subject.

~~Appeal~~ Petitions from
(1) The Agent of Munagi
Matt, objecting to
~~complaining against~~
the appointment of
Renuna (respt) as
of the Makkala Devara
Matt, ~~near~~ Kanakapur
~~in the~~ Magadi Taluk

(2) the 2nd petitioner and
And ~~Some~~ the disciples of
the Makkaladevara Matt

Decision The case came up
for final hearing on
16th April 1918. A
petitioners
for the ~~appellants~~

GPB—500—12-8-18

is Vn K Srinivasachi and
Ramachandra Aer prayed
for an adjournment, as they
expected the parties to come to
a Compromise. Mr M.
Basaniah Advocate for
the Counter petitioner had no objection
and the case was adjd.

On 9th April 1918, Mr
M. Krishnamurti, Advocate
for the Jeeyar matt,
and the parties appeared
before Court with a
"Razinama" under which
the Swamigal of the Jeeyar matt
requests that the
respt may be accepted
the "Jeeyar" of
Devanam matt
and the matt properties
be restored to
the possession of the

The Razinama facts of the case are
as follows:

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

Sudaviraswami of ... Matt died on 14th May 1907 without having nominated a Successor. Three days later a Sabha presided over by "Ayya" (a neighbouring institution) of the Kenchiga Vandi Matt was held, at which the 1st counterpetitioner was Chosen as Successor and given "Abhaya". - On the Inception of this Succession, the first petitioner took objection saying that the Makkaladevaru Matt was Subject to the Control of the Muraji Matt and that in the present instance the Muraji Matt had not been consulted. Petitions of Similar nature were also received from Some of the alleged disciples Makkaladevaru Matt, Chief Among whom ~~[illegible]~~ is the

Rs 1/W

R

petitioner. Pending the Settlement
of the matter, the properties
of the Matt were attached.

According to the
Compromise now arrived
at the Counter petitioner
is required by the Swamigalu
of the Muraj Matt as Successor
to the late Swamigalu of the Mahala
devara Matt in Consideration
of his having apologised and
his agreeing to seek the
Consent of the Swamigalu of the Muraj
Matt in the matter of the
future Succession to
the Mahalaadevara Matt.

The designation in the
Case Submitted by the
parties

G. R. S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

~~refd to~~ is accepted and the succession of Renuna alias Nianjana ~~Swami~~ Devaru ~~(resptd. to fore fmt).~~ as the "muti" of Mukkala Devaru matt is approved — The Dy. Commr Bangalore Dt is requested to withdraw the attachment and hand over the properties to the ~~Swamis~~ Devaru ~~respts~~ Nianjana ~~Swami~~

Memo No 3679 dt 16-3767-09-2 Dy C. 2

Copy to the Dy. Commr, Bangalore Dt, with the Vernacular read with his Letter no 35 dy 13th January 1910.

B—O.

19.5.10.

Asst Secy,

Muz Dept

7/5/18.

Print

GPB—20,000—7 7-14

Petitioners

Copies to the ~~Appellant~~

~~Counterpetitioner~~

~~Respondent~~

Nos. 3620 to 3622

d. 25-6-18

A.O

Ltr 19/5/18

~~Prodecy~~ Copy

Ltr 6/9/18

7-5-18.